

## Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

This template was built using the ITD ROI Submission Intranet application.

**FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED:** The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Department is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

This is a Pooled Technology Fund Request. Amount of funding requested: \$1,643.00

### Section I: Proposal

<b>Date:</b>	7/30/2003
<b>Agency Name:</b>	Inspections & Appeals
<b>Project Name:</b>	Obtaining CAD hardware and software for Project Re
<b>Agency Manager:</b>	Doran Pruisner
<b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>	(515)281-8429 / dpruisner@dia.state.ia.us
<b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b>	Steve Young

### D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

☐ YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

**Explanation:**

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

☐ YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

**Explanation:**

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

☒ YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Explanation:**

Allows greater security of the program information as well as reducing the physical space need to store information.

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

☒ YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

**Explanation:**

This project is necessary to comply with State Goals of Electronic Business.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (20 Points Maximum)**

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-20 points awarded.

--

---

**E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens****a. Project Participants**

List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

**Response:**

Adult Services Bureau, Health Facilities Division, of the Department of Inspections and Appeals, multiple registered Iowa architects and engineers, owners of the facilities that are regulated.

**b. Service Improvements**

Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

**Response:**

Currently architects and engineers send sets of drawings and specifications to state facility engineers for review of code compliance. This can be done more efficiently by using a CAD (Computer Aided Drafting) system. Architects and Engineers would be able to send drawings and specifications on a CD or by using the internet. Improving the communications mechanism will reduce the time it takes to review the drawings and specifications. Improving the review process will help the owners, architects, and contractors of these facilities to finish the projects sooner and with less possibility for errors in construction. This would then give the tenants the ability to move into finished projects sooner.

**c. Citizen Impact**

Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adopted rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

**Response:**

The main expenditure stakeholders would be the facility engineers that are responsible for the plan and specification review process for assisted living facilities, elder group homes, and nursing homes. The impact of this would be an increase in efficiency of the review process of these facilities and in turn help the citizens or tenants move into safer, better built facilities.

**d. Public Health and/or Safety**

Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

**Response:**

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves Customer Service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves Customer Service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves Customer Service (7-10 points).

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

---

## **F. Process Reengineering**

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

**Response:**

Currently owners that wish to build an assisted living facility, an elder group home, or a nursing home are required by code to have their plans and specifications sealed by a registered architect or engineer in the State of Iowa. Sealed drawings and specifications are then sent to the department of Inspections and Appeals for a plan review. Facility Engineers from the Department of Inspections and Appeals then review the project and check it for code compliance. The facility engineer will then write a report informing the architect or engineer of any code issues that need to be changed or modified. The architect or engineer would then change the drawing and specifications to reflect these changes. They would then resubmit all or a portion of the construction documents that were changed. Once all code compliant issues are resolved the project may be built as submitted. If an architect or engineer is allowed to submit their project electronically it will reduce the time of the review process and improve the time it takes to communicate information between the architect or engineer and the state facility engineer.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

**Response:**

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-2 points)

- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (3-4 points)
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (5)

## H. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades, ...

	FY05		FY06		FY07	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost (\$)	% Total Cost	Cost (\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$15,657	91%	\$1,500	100%	\$1,500	100%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IowAccess Fund	\$1,643	9%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$17,300	100%	\$1,500	100%	\$1,500	100%
Non-Pooled Tech. Total	\$15,657	91%	\$1,500	100%	\$1,500	100%

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

### Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points)
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points)
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10)

## I. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

☒ YES (If "YES", explain.) ☐ NO, it is a stand-alone project.

### Explanation:

We anticipate a successful project by offering an additional option for how architects and engineers submit plans and specifications for state review.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

### Explanation:

## J. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

**Response:**

Based on Section "H", 90.5% of the first year is covered by state funds and 100% each year there after.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

**Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)

**Section II: Financial Analysis****A. Project Budget Table**

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$0	1	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Software	\$0	4	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Hardware	\$0	3	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Training	\$0	4	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Facilities	\$0	1	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	4	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
ITD Services	\$0	4	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Supplies, Maint, etc.	\$0	1	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Other	\$0	1	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Totals	\$0	---	---	\$0	---	\$0

## C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

**1. Annual Pre-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

**Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:**

**Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:**

	State Total
<b>FTE Cost (salary plus benefits):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:</b>	\$0.00

**2. Annual Post-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

**Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:**

**Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:**

	State Total
<b>FTE Cost (salary plus benefits):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Total Annual Post-Project Cost:</b>	\$0.00

**3. Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on or waiting for the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

### Transaction Savings

Number of annual online transactions:	0
Hours saved/transaction:	0
Number of Citizens affected:	0
Value of Citizen Hour	0
Total Transaction Savings:	\$0

Other Savings (Describe)

\$0

**Total Savings:**

\$0

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss avoidance** - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

**Response:**

**5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable** - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

**Response:**

ROI Financial Worksheet	
A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1):	\$0
B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2):	\$0
State Government Benefit (= A-B):	\$0
Annual Benefit Summary:	\$0
State Government Benefit:	\$0
Citizen Benefit:	\$0
Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:	\$0
C. Total Annual Project Benefit:	\$0
D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table):	\$0
<b>Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) =</b>	0.00
<b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =</b>	0.00%

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (25 Points Maximum)**

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-8 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (9-16 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (17-25).

Note: For projects where no State Government Benefit, Citizen Benefit, or Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit is created due to the nature of the project, the Benefit/Cost Ratio and Return on Investment values are set to Zero.

## Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and

identify how they will be measured.

### **1. Improved customer service**

Currently architects and engineers send sets of drawings and specifications to state facility engineers for review of code compliance. This can be done more efficiently by using a CAD (Computer Aided Drafting) system. Architects and Engineers would be able to send drawings and specifications on a CD or by using the internet. Improving the communications mechanism will reduce the time it takes to review the drawings and specifications. Improving the review process will help the owners, architects, and contractors of these facilities to finish the projects sooner and with less possibility for errors in construction. This would then give the tenants the ability to move into finished projects sooner.

### **2. Citizen impact**

Will enable facilities to develop in a timelier manner.

### **3. Cost Savings**

Reduced state salaries in time spent in reviewing plans

### **4. Project reengineering**

### **5. Source of funds (Budget %)**

State funds 100%

### **6. Tangible/Intangible benefits**

Reduced time and salary savings for State Employees  
Facilities completed in a timely manner

[Return](#)